

REMARKS


The Office Action of 08/24/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected as being unpatentable over Boys in view of Lebens. Claim 7 was rejected as being unpatentable over Boys in view of Lebens further in view of Weindorf. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited references. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have been amended to recite that power for an LED having a predefined minimum forward voltage is supplied by a battery having a voltage less than the predefined minimum forward voltage. No such feature is believed to be taught or suggested by the cited references. In particular, the use of battery power in the arrangement of Boys, the primary reference, would defeat the purpose of the reference, which is to power roadway reflectors, fire egress lights, and the like, applications where battery power is impractical.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-8 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Ure', is written over a horizontal line.

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 11/26/2007